



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,477	10/23/2000	Gilbert Moineau	13693-8US AD/bns	8162

37462 7590 08/14/2007
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI
RIVERFRONT OFFICE
ONE MAIN STREET, ELEVENTH FLOOR
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/830,477

Applicant(s)

MOINEAU ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on July 26, 2007.

The Power of Attorney received July 27, 2007 has been accepted.

Claims 10 and 20 have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended.

Claims 23 and 24 have been newly added.

Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-24 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims contain the limitation "said DNS relay module is configured to consult said list and said attribute data in an order influenced, at least in part, by result speed." It is unclear from that limitation any characteristic of the order other than it hopes to increase result speed. The idea of having an order that results in faster speeds is an intended use and not a limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2155

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia (6023724) in view of Strentzech (6256671).

Regarding claim 1, Bhatia teaches a network modern device connecting a Local Area Network (LAN) to a remote network (Column 4, lines 36 – 39), comprising:

a local store containing a list of host names and attribute data (Column 6, lines 1 – 8):

a Domain Name Service (DNS) relay module (Column 6, lines 15 – 18); and

a router having a LAN interface connected to said LAN (Figure 1, element 340; Column 14, lines 19 – 20), a local connection to said DNS relay module and a network connection, to said remote network (Column 4, lines 45 – 47; Column 6, lines 11 – 14),

wherein said DNS relay module is configured to consult said list and said attribute data in an order influenced, at least in part, by result speed (Column 6, lines 15 – 48);

wherein said DNS relay module uses said list and said attribute data to respond to requests, received from said LAN via said router on said local connection (Column 6, lines 1 – 8), for a numeric address in response to a domain name when said domain name requested is on said list (Column 6, lines 15 – 18), and

said DNS relay module generates a DNS request and transmits said DNS request to an external DNS on said remote network via said local connection to said

router, and said DNS relay module returning a reply from said external DNS to said LAN via said local connection to said router to respond to said request for a numeric address when said domain name requested is not on said list (Column 6, lines 15 – 29).

Bhatia does not explicitly indicate a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data and that the DNS relay module uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name.

Strentzsch teaches a network device that connects a LAN and remote network (Column 5, lines 29 – 33), which includes a proxy name cache (Column 5, lines 54 – 56). The network device includes a DNX Proxy name cache that maintains a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data and uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name (Column 6, lines 11 – 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Strentzsch's teaching in Bhatia's system in order to allow Bhatia's system to allow the system to reduce the number of times the network device needs to query the name server.

Regarding claim 2, Bhatia teaches a network modem device as claimed in claim 1, wherein said attribute data is an IP address (Column 6, lines 4 – 5).

Regarding claim 3, Bhatia teaches a network modem device as claimed in claim 1, wherein said attribute data identifies a domain or host name as a local station on said

LAN and said, DNS relay module, when said domain or host name is identified as a local station on said LAN, replies locally to said request (Column 6, lines 1 – 18).

Regarding claim 4, Bhatia teaches a network modem device as claimed in claim 1, wherein said remote network connection is a connection to at least one ISDN channel (Column 4, lines 36 – 39).

Regarding claim 5, Bhatia teaches a network modem device as claimed in claim 4, wherein said router is connected to two ISDN channels: one for the intranet and one for the Internet (Column 5, line 64 – Column 6, line 1).

Regarding claim 6, Bhatia teaches a network modem device as claimed in claim 3, wherein said DNS relay module listens to NetBIOS Over IP packets of information on said LAN, extracts local computer names and associated IP addresses from said packets and adds said computer names and associated IP addresses to said list of domain names (Column 4, lines 56 – 61).

Regarding claim 8, Bhatia teaches the device according to claim 1, wherein said device is a digital network modem (Column 4, lines 36 – 39).

Regarding claim 9, Bhatia teaches the device according to claim 8, wherein said device is an ISDN modem (Column 4, lines 36 – 39).

Regarding claim 13, Bhatia teaches a method for relaying DNS requests on a LAN connected through a router to a remote network by a network modem device (Column 4, lines 36 – 39), comprising: a Domain Name Service (DNS) relay module (Column 6, lines 11 – 14) receiving a domain name request via said router having a LAN interface connected to said LAN (Figure 1, element 340; Column 14, lines 19 – 20),

Art Unit: 2155

a local connection to said DNS relay module and a network connection to said remote network, on said local connection, for a numeric address in response to a domain name (Column 6, lines 1 – 18); said DNS relay module using a local store containing a list of domain or host names and attribute data to respond to said request when said domain name requested is on said list (Column 6, line 1 – 8), wherein said list comprises a list of host names declared on said LAN with corresponding attributed data (Column 6, lines 1 – 8); and said DNS relay module generating a DNS request and transmitting said DNS request to an external DNS on said remote network via said local connection to said router, and said DNS relay module returning a reply from said external DNS to said LAN via said local connection to said router to respond to said request for a numeric address when said domain name requested is not on said list (Column 6, lines 15 – 29).

Bhatia does not explicitly indicate a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data and that the DNS relay module uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name.

Strentzsch teaches a network device that connects a LAN and remote network (Column 5, lines 29 – 33), which includes a proxy name cache (Column 5, lines 54 – 56). The network device includes a DNX Proxy name cache that maintains a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data and uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name (Column 6, lines 11 – 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Strentzsch's teaching in Bhatia's system in order to allow Bhatia's system to allow the system to reduce the number of times the network device needs to query the name server.

Regarding claim 14, Bhatia teaches a method as claimed in claim 13, wherein said attribute data identifies a domain name as a domain name for a device on said LAN (Column 6, lines 15 – 18).

Regarding claim 15, Bhatia teaches a method as claimed in claim 13, wherein said generating comprises requesting a numeric address on said external DNS and responding to said request with a numeric address corresponding to said domain or host name (Column 6, lines 4 – 29).

Regarding claim 16, Bhatia teaches a method as claimed in claim 13, wherein said attribute data is an IP address (Column 6, lines 4 – 5).

Regarding claim 17, Bhatia teaches a method as claimed in claim 14, wherein steps of listening to NetBIOS Over IP packets of information, extracting local computer names and IP addresses from said packets and adding said computer names and IP addresses to said list of domain names (Column 4, lines 56 – 61).

Regarding claim 18, Bhatia teaches a method as claimed in claim 17, wherein said list of computer names declared on the LAN is automatically built using packets of information sent by stations on said LAN using NetBIOS Over IP protocol in which said station name and IP address is available (Column 4, lines 56 – 61; Column 6, lines 20 – 23).

Regarding claims 11 and 21, Bhatia teaches the device according to claims 1 and 13, wherein said external DNS is one of a group of external DNS (Column 6, lines 5 – 6).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Bhatia teaches a network modem device as claimed in claims 2 and 13.

Bhatia does not explicitly indicate a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data and that the DNS relay module uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name.

Strentzsch teaches a network device that connects a LAN and remote network (Column 5, lines 29 – 33), which includes a proxy name cache (Column 5, lines 54 – 56). The network device includes a DNX Proxy name cache that maintains a list of domain names looked up on an external DNS corresponding attribute data and uses said list and attribute data without connecting to said external DNS when resolving said domain name (Column 6, lines 11 – 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Strentzsch's teaching in Bhatia's system in order to allow Bhatia's system to allow the system to reduce the number of times the network device needs to query the name server.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Bhatia teaches the device according to claims 1 and 13, wherein the order includes consulting the list of host names before the list of domain names (Column 32, lines 12 – 39; Column 43, lines 60 - 67; wherein whenever there is a DNS request, the local DNS on the LAN modem first determines if the

destination is another host on the LAN or if the message is destined for a remote server, thus using the second list for DNS resolution).

Claims 12 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia in view of Strentzsch as applied to claims above, and further in view of Huitema (6016512).

Regarding claims 12 and 22, Bhatia teaches the device as claimed in claims 1 and 13.

Bhatia does not explicitly indicate said list of domain names and attribute date has an expiry date and time, and said DNS relay module comprises a mechanism for requesting from an external DNS a newly fetched numeric address for said domain name when a next request for said domain name will be received, for restoring said newly fetched numeric address as the attribute data for said domain name In said list and for refreshing said expiry date and time

Huitema teaches that said list of domain names and attribute date has an expiry date and time, and said DNS relay module comprises a mechanism for requesting from an external DNS a newly fetched numeric address for said domain name when a next request for said domain name will be received, for restoring said newly fetched numeric address as the attribute data for said domain name In said list and for refreshing said expiry date and time (Column 3, line 59 – Column 4, line 2; Column 4, lines 52 – 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Huitema teaching in Bhatia's system in order to allow

Art Unit: 2155

Bhatia's system to allow the system to ensure any cached DNS information is current and up to date.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 24, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the reference, Bhatia does not teach consulting the list based on the fastest results", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Handwritten signature of Kevin Bates, consisting of a stylized 'K' followed by a '+' and 'BT'.

Kevin Bates
August 10, 2007